



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES AND NOTICES.

Columbia College is to have a chair of Hebrew (Rabbinic) literature. The sum of \$100,000, for this purpose, has been contributed by certain wealthy Jews of New York city.

Dr. Cheyne's new book, "Job and Solomon," noticed in the April *STUDENT*, is published in this country by Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, New York city. The price is \$2.25, not \$1.25, as announced.

The trustees of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, have voted to establish at once a professorship of oriental languages and literature. This chair will be distinct from that of Old Testament interpretation.

It is but justice to the managing editor of *Hebraica*, to say that the note of Henry S. Morais on Neubauer's "Etymologies" in April *Hebraica*, was inserted only at the earnest request of Mr. Morais, and upon his responsibility, *after his assurance by the editor* that Prof. Neubauer's "Etymologies" were intended as a joke.

If twenty additional subscribers can be obtained, a new edition of *Pithom*, by M. Edouard Naville, of which Prof. Gillett wrote so fully in the January *STUDENT*, will be published. Few works in the line of archæological research have been more interesting. There ought to be a demand for several editions. The matter is in the hands of Rev. Wm. C. Winslow, 429 Beacon street, Boston.

Professor John G. Lansing, New Brunswick, N. J., sails this week for Egypt. While absent, Prof. Lansing will collect material for a work in the line of Arabic literature. His Arabic Manual, recently published, has become the authority in Egypt for missionaries learning the language. Immediately upon his return from Egypt, he will publish an Arabic Chrestomathy and Summary of Syntax, which will serve as a companion-volume to the Arabic Manual.

Much interest, and not a few "warlike" editorials have been inspired by Capt. C. R. Conder's article, "The Old Testament; Ancient Monuments, and Modern Critics," in the March *Contemporary Review*. In the strongest possible manner the writer contrasts the results of monumental research and destructive

criticism, the former every-where substantiating, the latter endeavoring to destroy the credibility of the Bible. Captain Conder selects Wellhausen as the representative of modern critics, and aims to show (1) that Wellhausen himself is ignorant of monumental "facts;" (2) that his hypothesis is constructed without regard to these "facts," and (3) that, in short, these "facts" are in direct opposition to Wellhausen's hypothesis and all similar hypotheses.

This article, as well as the reply to it in the April number by Robertson Smith, is well worth reading. It most certainly contains material of which it will be difficult for the "destructive" critic to make satisfactory disposition. It is not to be forgotten, however, that the arguments are based almost entirely upon linguistic evidence, and that Captain Conder does not pretend to be a Semitic scholar. He uses material second-hand, and, we are sorry to say, does not always choose the best authority. His predilection for Lenormant is too decided. However this may be, it is clear from this discussion that *external* testimony, gathered from the monuments, will hereafter play a more important part in the critical discussion.

Prof. T. Witton Davies, of Haverford Baptist College, South Wales, proposes a Hebrew Institute for Great Britain. In the *Athenæum* of March 19th he reviews the work of the American Institute of Hebrew, and suggests that some such an organization is needed in England. "It could help in the publication of suitable grammars and lexicons; it could see to the issue of good periodicals, keeping students well up with the latest information; it could make it much more possible to produce polyglotts, and other great works involving large outlays, too large for private enterprise to deal with, as the experience of some very strong and respectable firms has proved; it would awaken an *esprit de corps* that would itself be a gain to oriental learning." He suggests that perhaps this Institute would do well to assist in increasing the circulation, size and character of "the already excellent" *Hebraica*, rather than start a Hebrew or Semitic quarterly of its own. In the following number of the *Athenæum* (March 26) Prof. Terrien de Lacouperie makes a short reply which shows that his ideas upon the subject are somewhat vague. A later number contains other letters by Prof. Davies and Mr. Hyde Clark. Something will undoubtedly result from this discussion. It is not periodical and book publishing that our English friends so much need, as *teaching*. The professors in the English Universities have in many cases come to believe that all teaching is drudgery. It is even a great burden to lecture. If a movement could be inaugurated looking to the encouragement of *teaching* the Semitic languages, it would meet with a hearty response from hundreds of men who feel the need of such instruction.

The following "note" was received from Prof. H. P. Smith too late to be placed with his article in a former part of this number:—

"Since the above was sent to the editor I have noticed Cornill's contribution to the same subject in the prolegomena to his Ezekiel. I will quote what he says (pp. 174, 175).

"In chapters XL. to XLVIII. we find for the Hebrew *Adhonay Yahweh* not

Kurios Kurios, but regularly *Kurios ho Theos* 'Lord God.' No commentator has noticed this remarkable fact, or mentioned it; but it gives us an important hint for the comprehension of this section [of the book], and throws unexpected light on the burning problem of Pentateuch criticism. That the *Kurios ho Theos* was not simple guesswork, but the faithful reproduction of the Hebrew text before the LXX. translators, will be readily admitted by those who are well informed. It follows that, in the Alexandrine recension of Ezekiel, the divine name throughout these chapters was *Yahweh Elohim*. That the change is intentional cannot be doubted, and an explanation lies near at hand. In the earlier section of the book *Yahweh* is *Adhonay* 'the Lord;' his relation to Israel is essentially legal. In the last part, on the other hand, he is *Elohim* 'God;' and this relation is a relation of grace. In the time brought before us in chh. XL.-XLVIII. the promise is realized that *Yahweh* will become *Elohim* to them. But this explanation alone is not sufficient; the prophet's intention in this change of names is more significant still. In the present Old Testament there is only one passage in which we meet *Yahweh Elohim*, Gen. II. and III., the history of Paradise. *Evidently Ezekiel would make his vision of the New Jerusalem parallel to this narrative.* Humanity, having ended its cycle of sin and error, returns to its starting-point; the future salvation which follows chastisement is for Israel a new creation, a restoration of the original paradisaic condition, with peace between God and man,—so in substance, although of course in a different form. . . . It follows then, necessarily, that Ezekiel must have read the first chapters of his Pentateuch with the double divine name. Budde's recent assertion, that this must be traced to an inner-jahvistic process, receives this way an unexpected confirmation.'

"The question of an 'inner-jahvistic process' we need not enter upon. The indications that Ezekiel read the early chapters of the Pentateuch as we read them, are very welcome."